UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,975	01/15/2004	Pawel Z. Chadzynski	20768/2012	4258

29934 7590 10/01/2008

PALMER & DODGE, LLP
RICHARD B. SMITH
111 HUNTINGTON AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02199

EXAMINER	
WOOD, WILLIAM H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2193	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/757,975	CHADZYNSKI, PAWEL Z.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William H. Wood	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 June 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12 and 14-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12 and 14-31* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-12 and 14-31 are pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 and 14-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Notani** et al. (USPN 6,567,783 B1) in view of **Thackston** (US 6,928,396 B2).

Claim 1

Notani disclosed a computerized method for collaborating over a network to manipulate a design using a plurality of heterogeneous user applications running on respective clients connected to the network *(column 1, lines 50-55)*, said method comprising the steps of:

connecting a session client process to a session manager over the network to participate in a collaborative session *(figure 14, column 15, lines 17-33)*;

sharing session control messages with other session client processes connected to said session manager *(figure 14, column 15, lines 17-33)*;

loading design data representing said design into a local application running on said client *(figure 14, column 15, lines 17-33)*;

creating at least one application state file representing at least one application state of said local application based on at least one manipulation of said design using said local application *(figure 14, column 15, lines 17-33)*;

communicating said at least one application state file from said session client process to said other session client processes via said session manager *(figure 14, column 15, lines 17-33)*;

receiving loading at least one application state file created by other local applications and communicated from said other session clients via said session manager *(figures 5-6, 14; column 5, lines 35-54; column 6, lines 20-22, 33-45; column 11, lines 14-25, 66-67; column 14, lines 56-57, 65-67; column 15, lines 3-5, 17-33; the systems allows collaboration using data/objects, state files, in a user controlled collaboration space in conjunction with workflow management and event communication between applications local to various systems)*

presenting the at least one application state file created by other local applications to a user *(figure 5 ; column 5, lines 35-47, "used to share data/objects between various entities in the collaboration"; workspace and applications)*;

allowing the user to delay the instantiation of the at least one application state file created by other local applications *(column 5, lines 51-53, "permissionabilities can be assigned by-user-by-operation ... operations can be read, write, take, and subscribe"; user in control)*; and

loading the at least one application state file created by other local applications, thereby allowing the user to manipulate a first aspect of the design before loading changes made to a second aspect of the design by another user *(column 5, lines 51-53, "permissionabilities can be assigned by-user-by-operation ... operations can be read, write, take, and subscribe"; user in control)*.

Notani did not explicitly state manipulating a design representing electrical or mechanical assemblies. **Thackston** demonstrated that it was known at the time of invention to make use of, in a distributed environment, collaboration on a design representing electrical or mechanical assemblies (column 1, lines 21-35; column 3, lines 55-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the distributed collaboration on workflows of **Notani** with product design corresponding to workflows as found in **Thackston**'s teaching. This implementation would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to reduce cost and facilitate ease of development (**Thackston**: column 6, lines 11-15) and efficient management of complex manufacturing processes (**Notani**: column 1, lines 41-42).

Claim 2

Notani disclosed the method of claim 1 wherein said at least one application state is encoded using normalized XML structures to create said at least one application state

file, and wherein said at least one application state file is communicated as an XML message *(column 3, line 55; and column 7, lines 47-49)*.

Claim 3

Notani disclosed the method of claim 2 wherein said XML structures are based on domain specific conventions defined in the context of the type of design data *(column 3, lines 44-45)*.

Claim 4

Notani disclosed the method of claim 1 further comprising saving said session controls and said at least one application state file in a journal file *(column 14, lines 39-42; figure 14)*.

Claim 5

Notani disclosed the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of scheduling said collaborative session *(column 14, lines 39-42)*.

Claim 6

Notani disclosed the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of conducting a text-based conversation with said other session clients *(column 14, lines 39-42)*.

Claim 7

Notani disclosed the method of claim 1 further comprising the steps of logging in to said collaborative session and logging out of said collaborative session *(column 14, lines 39-42)*.

Claim 8

Notani disclosed the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of controlling the loading of said application state file at a time selected by the user *(column 5, lines 51-53; column 14, lines 39-42)*.

Claim 9

Notani disclosed the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of displaying design manipulations corresponding to said application state file created and communicated by said other application files *(figures 10 and 11)*.

Claim 10

Notani disclosed the method of claim 1 wherein said design is manipulated without having to transmit design images between said heterogeneous applications *(column 3, line 55, using these standards)*.

Claim 12

Notani disclosed the computerized method of claim 11 wherein said method is an asynchronous method of collaboration *(column 6, line 22)*.

Claim 13

Notani disclosed the computerized method of claim 11 wherein said journal file provides interactive instructions when played back on said another computer *(figure 14)*.

Claim 15

Notani disclosed the computerized method of claim 14 wherein the step of manipulating said design includes highlighting said design object, and wherein said other of said applications highlights said corresponding design object upon reading said application state file *(column 11, lines 62-65)*.

Claim 16

Notani disclosed the computerized method of claim 14 wherein said heterogeneous applications collaborate bi-directionally *(figure 14, element 212)*.

Claims 11, 14 and 17-25

Claims 11, 14 and 17-25 correspond to claims 1-10 and are rejected in a corresponding manner.

Claims 11 and 22

Additionally, **Notani** did not explicitly state training a user. Official Notice is taken that it was known at the time of invention to train users via a network. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the collaborative session of **Notani** with training. This implementation would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide skilled users with the ability to fully make use of the system.

Claims 26-27 and 29

Claims 26-27 and 29 correspond to claims 1-10 and are rejected in a corresponding manner.

Claim 28

Notani and **Thackston** disclose the method of claim 26 wherein the at least one local application state event is at least one of a plurality of normalized application state events recognized by each of the heterogeneous user applications *(**Thackston**: column 5, lines 50-53)*.

Claim 30

Notani discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of:

allowing the user to refuse the instantiation of the at least one application state file created by other local applications *(column 5, lines 51-53)*.

Claim 31

Notani discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of:

buffering the at least one application state file created by other local applications *(column 5, lines 35-47, the workspace itself; column 5, lines 51-53, buffered by user control).*

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 30 June 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues: newly added limitations are not disclosed; **Notani** does not disclose collaboration on an electrical or mechanical assembly; no disclosure of applications running on a single client. The first issue is addressed with the above refined rejections. The second issue is addressed by the combination of **Notani** and **Thackston**. The third issue is addressed in that **Notani** does not make a distinction between solely local and solely non-local applications to a single client. The cited art works regardless of where the applications are found (for example: column 5, lines 39-42, native applications; column 11, lines 14-24). Having addressed Applicant's raised issues, the rejections are maintained as indicated.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. Wood whose telephone number is (571)-272-3736. The examiner can normally be reached 10:00am - 4:00pm Tuesday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis A. Bullock Jr. can be reached on (571)-272-3759. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571)273-8300 for regular communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained form either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR systems, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. For questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

/William H. Wood/
William H. Wood
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2193
October 3, 2008